

# CALFED BAY-DELTA WATERSHED PROGRAM

## BDAC Watershed Work Group Meeting Summary

The Bay-Delta Advisory Council (BDAC) Watershed Work Group met on September 28, 1998, in Auburn. The BDAC Watershed Work Group (Work Group) was created to address the public's request to have more participation in the CALFED Watershed Program (Watershed Program). The Work Group provides a forum for stakeholders covering a broad geographic area and wide array of interests. Attendees of the Work Group meetings have direct interaction with the Watershed Program's Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT) and an opportunity to review and comment on Watershed Program draft documents. In addition, the Work Group may provide input to the BDAC on issues related to the Watershed Program.

### Introductions

Martha Davis (BDAC/Regional Council for Rural Counties), co-chair of the Work Group, began the meeting with introductions. A list of meeting participants is included (Attachment A). The following meeting materials were distributed: *Agenda*; *Revised Goals and Objectives*; *Revised Stage I Implementation Actions*; *Revised Principles for Participation*; *Summary of the Watershed Program Plan Elements*; and *Draft Watershed Program Plan*.

The agenda items were reviewed and the Work Group was asked to peruse through the Draft Watershed Program Plan during the break in order to hold a discussion afterwards.

### CALFED Schedule

Judy Kelly (CALFED Bay-Delta Program) briefly discussed the CALFED schedule. She explained that the October 23, 1998, is the due date for the internal CALFED agency review of the Watershed Program Plan and other CALFED documents. However, the final deadline for all CALFED documents is December 7, 1998. At this time, the Watershed Program Plan will be reproduced and attached as an appendix to the Final Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Programmatic EIS/EIR). The Programmatic EIS/EIR will be released to the public in mid-December for a 60-day review period.

### Review of Documents

The following documents were reviewed by the Work Group: *Draft Goals and Objectives*; *Draft Stage I Implementation Actions*; and *Draft Principles for Participation*. Some revisions were made to the language of these documents. Please see the attached redline-strikeout versions of the documents to view the changes which were consensus of the Work Group (Attachments B, C, and D).

In addition to the specific language revisions, the following remarks were noted:

- Some concern was expressed regarding the deletion of the language referring to the development of models (*Revised Goals and Objectives*). However, it was noted that CALFED staff revised the wording to be more inclusive by simply stating, “illustrate the benefits...” The use of models is one tool to achieve this objective. It was recommended that the use of models and other means to illustrate the benefits that accrue from watershed plans and projects be more fully discussed in the Program Element section of the Watershed Program Plan.
- Several meeting participants stated that more information regarding the Comprehensive Monitoring Assessment and Research Program (CMARP) would be helpful. Julie Tupper (IWAT/U.S. Forest Service) explained that CMARP is currently working with each of the CALFED Common Programs in developing a series of monitoring protocols. Ann Dennis is leading the efforts for the CMARP Watershed Assessment Team. In addition, CMARP has established a group of scientists to meet with local watershed groups to discuss monitoring efforts, both on-going and future. The Work Group recommended that a CMARP representative attend a future Work Group meeting to present an overview of CMARP and explain the relationship between CMARP and local watershed groups.
- Laurel Ames presented new language to the Work Group to replace Objective VI of the Goals and Objectives document. After some discussion, a consensus was reached to replace two of the original bullets with the suggested language (see Attachment B). The following two proposed statements will be incorporated into the Watershed Program Plan’s Implementation Strategy:
  - *Review a full range of institutional options for Program implementation mechanisms, including federal, state and local governments, tribal councils, and non-profits.*
  - *Prepare a long-term plan that identifies:  
the principles of sustainability,  
the financial resource required,  
the institutional resources required,  
the potential sources of funds,  
the potential institutional opportunities, and  
the delivery system for planning and project management.*

### **Program Elements Discussion**

John Lowrie (IWAT/Natural Resources Conservation District) presented an overview of the transition from the *Goals and Objectives* document to the Watershed Program Plan Elements. It was explained that Objective I - V will be presented as a separate Program Plan Element, and each sub-objective (bulleted statement) will be listed as a sub-element. However, Objective VI, referring to Implementation, will be presented in a separate chapter entitled “Implementation Strategy.”

The Work Group reviewed the Draft Watershed Program Plan and made the following comments:

### ***Glossary***

- The Watershed Program Plan should include a glossary of terms to alleviate any misunderstandings of the intended use of particular words. Some terms to define include: watershed, watershed group, and watershed program.

### ***Vision***

- The Vision statement currently refers to *one* watershed organization. This should be corrected to read as *multiple* watershed organizations.
- The language of the document should not be prescriptive.
- The term “management” should be avoided because of its misleading connotations.
- The upper watersheds should be recognized for their importance by other Common Programs and all water users, without losing sight of the importance of San Joaquin and other watersheds. Little attention has been given to the San Joaquin area in many respects, such as recognition, concept, and funding; it should be noted that this area is also a key component of the CALFED/Watershed programs.
- Enhancement of capacity should be included in the Vision statement.
- Emphasis should be placed on the importance of watershed restoration and maintenance.

### ***Education***

- Language should be consistent with the Goals and Objectives; strike “baseline” from “baseline support.”

### ***Watershed Processes***

- The Watershed Processes element reads “top-down;” CALFED should not be the only entity to implement the activities presented in this section. Be sure to include watershed groups and other stakeholder participation in implementation.

### ***Adaptive Management***

- Monitoring should include inventory and assessment. Baseline conditions of both a given project, and a given watershed is a key component of monitoring.
- It is important to note that adaptive management can re-define management direction.
- The adaptive management and monitoring component should not be implemented solely by CALFED/IWAT, but should include adequate stakeholder involvement.

### ***Coordination and Assistance***

- The discussion regarding the delineation of a watershed should be in the Introduction

section.

### ***Geographic Scope***

- The geographic scope should not be divided between “upper and lower” watersheds. Instead the Watershed Program Plan should emphasize the importance of *all* watersheds related to the Bay-Delta system.

### **Wrap-up**

The meeting attendees were thanked for their participation. E-mail addresses of CALFED staff and IWAT were given to the meeting participants to provide further comments on the Watershed Program Plan elements. Comments received by October 7, 1998, will be addressed in the next draft of the Watershed Program Plan.

The next Work Group meeting was scheduled for Monday, November 2, 1998. Recommended locations included Fresno, Modesto, Santa Clara County, Williams, Walnut Grove, and Sonoma.

## *Attachment A*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization/Agency</b>	<b>E-mail Address</b>
Aumack, Laurie	Battle Creek Watershed Project	laurie_aumack@hotmail.com
Barrett, Lee	Coon Creek Restoration Project	
Barretta, Ben	Nevada Irrigation District	barretta@NID.dst.ca.us
Barris, Lynn	Butte Environmental Council/Cherokee	lbarris@ecst.csuchico.edu
Breninger, David	Placer County Water Agency	
Cativuela, J.P.	California Rice Industry Association	jperice@aol.com
Changry, Jim	Nevada Irrigation District	
Cooper-Carter, Kristin	CSU Research Foundation	kcooper-carter@csuchico.edu
Cornwall, Caitlin	Sonoma Ecology Center	sec@vom.com
Curtis, Bill	Northern California Water Agencies	
Dale, Richard	Sonoma Ecology Center	sec@vom.com
Davis, Martha	Bay-Delta Advisory Council	
de Haas, Merv	El Dorado County Water Agency	merv@el-dorado.ca.us
Drake, Nettie	Panoche/Silver Creek CRMP	nrdrake@spiralcomm.net
Dubois, Bill	California Farm Bureau Federation	
Harthorn, Allen	Butte Creek Conservancy	
Henly, Russ	California Department of Forestry/IWAT	russ_henly@fire.ca.gov
Jerould, Frank	Amador RCD	
Kelly, Judy	CALFED Bay-Delta Program	jkelly@water.ca.gov
Knecht, Mary Lee	CALFED Consultant Team - Jones & Stokes	maryk@jsanet.com
Lowrie, John	CALFED/IWAT/NRCS	lowrie@water.ca.gov
Macon, Dan	California Farm Water Coalition	dmacon@calweb.com
Meacher, Robert	BDAC/RCRC	
Nakamura, Gary	Shasta-Tehama Bioregional Council	gmnakamura@ucdavis.edu
Newlin, Vickie	Butte County Water Division	
Patterson, Steve	EDAW	patterson@edaw.com
Robert, James		gems@ns.net
Sime, Fraser	Department of Water Resources	simef@water.ca.gov
Tupper, Julie	U.S. Forest Service/IWAT	rfo@calweb.com
Woodward, George	UC Berkeley	badger@nature.berkeley.edu



